



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,368	08/27/2003	Yukinobu Momozono	116609	3702
25944	7590	11/01/2005	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			WANG, JIN CHENG	
P.O. BOX 19928				
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2672

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/648,368

Applicant(s)

MOMOZONO ET AL.

Examiner

Jin-Cheng Wang

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's submission filed on 8/29/2005 has been entered. Claims 1, and 9-10 have been amended. Claims 1-10 are pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed August 29, 2005 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection of the amended claim 1 based on Koyama et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,542,161 (hereinafter Koyama) in view of Okada et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,914,615 (hereinafter Okada). As set forth in the present Office Action, Koyama teaches a font processor, comprising:

A data acquiring device (e.g., Fig. 15A-15E) that acquires font data of bitmap fonts (*the display device 10 acquires font data as defined on a sub-pixel by sub-pixel basis; see column 11-12 and in particular see column 20, lines 45-54 for the character code being input to the display device having the character size represented as 20 dots by 20 dots; see also Fig. 29A wherein the line width of the character may be input from the input device 30 to the control section 20 and a straight line or curve may be generated according to the input line width information of the character, defining the sub-pixels along the straight line or curve as corresponding to the basic portion of the character*);

A subpixel-font generating device (e.g., Fig. 15A-15E) that analyzes a pixel arrangement of the font data by pattern correction to generate subpixel fonts that have data in subpixels (*e.g., the subpixel font generating is performed in the character display program along with a plurality*

Art Unit: 2672

*of pattern fonts stored in the storage apparatus 40. The "pattern correction" can be done through controlling the color element level of each subpixel; see column 12, lines 10-62; and the sub-pixel arrangement is discussed in column 13, lines 15-27; Moreover, the skeleton shape of a character as defined in 42d, the correction table 42e and the brightness table 42c of the auxiliary storage apparatus 40 which collectively **stores the correction patterns of fonts**; see column 19, lines 38-55; see also column 21, lines 33-42, column 29, lines 22-67, column 30, lines 1-57, column 31, lines 11-40 and Figs. 52A-67A in which the cited reference discloses the color element level of each sub-pixel arranged in the vicinity of a sub-pixel corresponding to the basic portion of the character set to one of level 6 to level 0 according to a **predetermined correction pattern selection rule** and auxiliary pattern selection rule and the setting of the color element level may be performed by using the correction table 42e stored in the auxiliary storage apparatus; see column 22, lines 44-61 and column 24, lines 11-38 for the selection of the **correction font patterns**. Therefore, the cited reference discloses using the **correction font patterns table to match for a correction font pattern to be used for the bitmap font wherein the correction font pattern identifies a horizontal line, a vertical line or diagonal line of pixels or sub-pixels having a gradation level 3 for example, see Figs. 3, 12, 19-26**);*

A gradation controlling device (e.g., Figs. 15A-15E) that controls gradation levels of the subpixels constituting subpixel fonts (*The character display program along with a plurality of pattern fonts stored in the storage apparatus 40 and when executed by the CPU 21, the character font is generated by correcting the color element level of each subpixel and the brightness level of each sub-pixel is transferred to the display device 10; Figs. 52A-67A and the corresponding disclosure regarding these figures. Therefore, the cited reference discloses using*

the correction font patterns table to match for a correction font pattern to be used for the bitmap font wherein the correction font pattern identifies a horizontal line, a vertical line or diagonal line of pixels or sub-pixels having a gradation level 3 for example, see Figs. 3, 12, 19-26).

Koyama does not expressly disclose the term “pattern matching”.

However, Okada discloses correction patterns having bitmap data which represents a line of hatched box having a bit with value 1 wherein the line having different angles forms a diagonal line, a horizontal line or a vertical line (See Figs. 20-27B; column 19-21) and therefore, Okada discloses the claim limitation of “pattern matching identifying whether an array of pixels contains a horizontal, vertical or diagonal line”.

Koyama discloses pattern correction using a plurality of patterns including the auxiliary patterns according to the font typefaces and sizes (see e.g., Figs. 55-56 wherein a plurality of patterns are disclosed with each attribute table with respect to the character size and typeface or stroke). It would have been obvious to have modified Koyama’s patterns for correcting the subpixel color levels using the pattern matching of finding the correct pattern with respect to the particular font typeface and size. Koyama discloses ***using the correction font patterns table to match for a correction font pattern to be used for the bitmap font wherein the correction font pattern identifies a horizontal line, a vertical line or diagonal line of pixels or sub-pixels having a gradation level 3 for example, see Figs. 3, 12, 19-26.***

It would have been obvious to have used any pattern matching technique, if there is a difference at all, from those disclosed in Koyama to control the color gradation levels of the subpixels in which the font bitmap array contains a correction font pattern identifying a

Art Unit: 2672

horizontal line, a vertical line or diagonal line of pixels or sub-pixels having a specific gradation level. It would also have been obvious to have incorporated Okada's pattern matching identifying the bitmap data having a line of sub-pixels with a specific color levels using the pattern correction table into Koyama's font processor because Koyama teaches correction font pattern tables as well. Moreover, Okada teaches other claim limitations set forth in the base claims (See Okada Figs. 20-27B; column 19-21).

One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to virtually increase the resolution of the characters being displayed on the display device and parts of a character such as oblique lines or curves can be displayed smooth and thereby significantly improving the character display quality (Koyama column 10, lines 1-7 and Okada Figs. 20-27B; column 19-21).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant

Art Unit: 2672

art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

For example, the base claim 1 recites the two “the pattern matching identifying whether an array of pixels contains a horizontal, vertical, or diagonal line.” However, the specification only describes whether the matching area corresponds to one of the patterns identifying a horizontal line, a vertical line or a diagonal line of pixels constituting a character in an array of pixels for a bitmap font. It cannot be ascertained from the claim language what applicant is meant by “a horizontal line, vertical line or diagonal line”. It is not necessary true that the pattern matching is to identify a horizontal, vertical or diagonal line of pixels or symbols constituting the character because the pattern matching can also be used to identify a horizontal, vertical or diagonal line of pixels or symbols constituting the background or to identify a horizontal, vertical or diagonal line of pixels or symbols having no reference (See Pages 6-8 of applicant’s specification wherein various symbols are used to identify pixels for the array of pixels representing a portion of the bitmap font). Thus, the metes and bounds of the coverage of at least base claim 1 cannot be ascertained.

To comply with the “written description” requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, an applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the “written description” inquiry, whatever is now claimed. *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Fed. Cir. 1991). For purposes of written description, one shows “possession” by descriptive means such as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention. *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107

Art Unit: 2672

F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Such descriptive means cannot be found in the disclosure for the inventions of the base claim 1.

Claims 2-8 depend upon the claim 1 and are rejected due to their dependency on the claim 1.

Claims 9 and 10 recites the same claim limitation of “the pattern matching identifying whether an array of pixels contains a horizontal, vertical, or diagonal line” as the claim 1 and are subject to the same rationale of rejection set forth in the claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

For example, the base claim 1 recites the two “the pattern matching identifying whether an array of pixels contains a horizontal, vertical, or diagonal line.” However, the specification only describes whether the matching area corresponds to one of the patterns identifying a horizontal line, a vertical line or a diagonal line of pixels constituting a character in an array of pixels for a bitmap font. It cannot be ascertained from the claim language set forth in the base claim 1 what is meant by “a horizontal, vertical or diagonal line”. Applicant failed to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The pattern matching can also be used to identify a horizontal, vertical or diagonal line of pixels or

Art Unit: 2672

symbols constituting the background or to identify a horizontal, vertical or diagonal line of pixels or symbols having no reference (See Pages 6-8 of applicant's specification wherein various symbols are used to identify pixels for the array of pixels representing a portion of the bitmap font). Thus, the metes and bounds of the coverage of at least base claim 1 cannot be ascertained.

Claims 2-8 depend upon the claim 1 and are rejected due to their dependency on the claim 1.

Claims 9 and 10 recites the same claim limitation of "the pattern matching identifying whether an array of pixels contains a horizontal, vertical, or diagonal line" as the claim 1 and are subject to the same rationale of rejection set forth in the claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,542,161 (hereinafter Koyama) in view of Okada et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,914,615 (hereinafter Okada).

Re Claims 1, 9 and 10:

Koyama teaches a font processor, comprising:

A data acquiring device (e.g., Fig. 15A-15E) that acquires font data of bitmap fonts (*the display device 10 acquires font data as defined on a sub-pixel by sub-pixel basis; see column 11-12 and in particular see column 20, lines 45-54 for the character code being input to the display device having the character size represented as 20 dots by 20 dots; see also Fig. 29A wherein the line width of the character may be input from the input device 30 to the control section 20 and a straight line or curve may be generated according to the input line width information of the character, defining the sub-pixels along the straight line or curve as corresponding to the basic portion of the character*);

A subpixel-font generating device (e.g., Fig. 15A-15E) that analyzes a pixel arrangement of the font data by pattern correction to generate subpixel fonts that have data in subpixels (e.g., *the subpixel font generating is performed in the character display program along with a plurality of pattern fonts stored in the storage apparatus 40. The "pattern correction" can be done through controlling the color element level of each subpixel; see column 12, lines 10-62; and the sub-pixel arrangement is discussed in column 13, lines 15-27; Moreover, the skeleton shape of a character as defined in 42d, the correction table 42e and the brightness table 42c of the auxiliary storage apparatus 40 which collectively **stores the correction patterns of fonts**; see column 19, lines 38-55; see also column 21, lines 33-42, column 29, lines 22-67, column 30, lines 1-57, column 31, lines 11-40 and Figs. 52A-67A in which the cited reference discloses the color element level of each sub-pixel arranged in the vicinity of a sub-pixel corresponding to the basic portion of the character set to one of level 6 to level 0 according to a **predetermined correction pattern selection rule** and auxiliary pattern selection rule and the setting of the color element level may be performed by using the correction table 42e stored in the auxiliary storage*

Art Unit: 2672

apparatus; see column 22, lines 44-61 and column 24, lines 11-38 for the selection of the correction font patterns. Therefore, the cited reference discloses using the correction font patterns table to match for a correction font pattern to be used for the bitmap font wherein the correction font pattern identifies a horizontal line, a vertical line or diagonal line of pixels or sub-pixels having a gradation level 3 for example, see Figs. 3, 12, 19-26);

A gradation controlling device (e.g., Figs. 15A-15E) that controls gradation levels of the subpixels constituting subpixel fonts (*The character display program along with a plurality of pattern fonts stored in the storage apparatus 40 and when executed by the CPU 21, the character font is generated by correcting the color element level of each subpixel and the brightness level of each sub-pixel is transferred to the display device 10; Figs. 52A-67A and the corresponding disclosure regarding these figures. Therefore, the cited reference discloses using the correction font patterns table to match for a correction font pattern to be used for the bitmap font wherein the correction font pattern identifies a horizontal line, a vertical line or diagonal line of pixels or sub-pixels having a gradation level 3 for example, see Figs. 3, 12, 19-26).*

Koyama does not expressly disclose the term “pattern matching”.

However, Okada discloses correction patterns having bitmap data which represents a line of hatched box having a bit with value 1 wherein the line having different angles forms a diagonal line, a horizontal line or a vertical line (See Figs. 20-27B; column 19-21) and therefore, Okada discloses the claim limitation of “pattern matching identifying whether an array of pixels contains a horizontal, vertical or diagonal line”.

Koyama discloses pattern correction using a plurality of patterns including the auxiliary patterns according to the font typefaces and sizes (see e.g., Figs. 55-56 wherein a plurality of patterns are disclosed with each attribute table with respect to the character size and typeface or stroke). It would have been obvious to have modified Koyama's patterns for correcting the subpixel color levels using the pattern matching of finding the correct pattern with respect to the particular font typeface and size. Koyama discloses *using the correction font patterns table to match for a correction font pattern to be used for the bitmap font wherein the correction font pattern identifies a horizontal line, a vertical line or diagonal line of pixels or sub-pixels having a gradation level 3 for example, see Figs. 3, 12, 19-26.*

It would have been obvious to have used any pattern matching technique, if there is a difference at all, from those disclosed in Koyama to control the color gradation levels of the subpixels in which the font bitmap array contains a correction font pattern identifying a horizontal line, a vertical line or diagonal line of pixels or sub-pixels having a specific gradation level. It would also have been obvious to have incorporated Okada's pattern matching identifying the bitmap data having a line of sub-pixels with a specific color levels using the pattern correction table into Koyama's font processor because Koyama teaches correction font pattern tables as well. Moreover, Okada teaches other claim limitations set forth in the base claims (See Okada Figs. 20-27B; column 19-21).

One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to virtually increase the resolution of the characters being displayed on the display device and parts of a character such as oblique lines or curves can be displayed smooth and thereby significantly

Art Unit: 2672

improving the character display quality (Koyama column 10, lines 1-7 and Okada Figs. 20-27B; column 19-21).

Re Claims 2-3:

Koyama does not explicitly disclose the term “shifting the subpixels”.

However, Koyama discloses pattern correction using a plurality of patterns including the auxiliary patterns according to the font typefaces and sizes (*see e.g., Figs. 55-56 wherein a plurality of patterns are disclosed with each attribute table with respect to the character size and typeface or stroke*). Koyama further discloses setting the color levels for the sub-pixels according to the pattern data and therefore the color levels for the sub-pixels constituting the character increases and the color levels for the sub-pixels constituting the background decreases (Figs. 5-8, 12 and 14). Koyama further discloses the brightness levels are shifted (column 11, lines 25-38) and the brightness table defines the relationship between the color element level of a sub-pixel and the brightness level of the sub-pixel and thereby the brightness levels can be shifted in Koyama. Finally, Koyama discloses adjusting the intervals between the characters on a sub-pixel by sub-pixel basis (column 11, lines 52-64) and therefore Koyama suggests the claim limitation of “shifting the subpixels”.

It would have been obvious to have modified Koyama’s shifting the brightness levels of the sub-pixels using the shifting of the subpixel positions or changing the character intervals by shifting the subpixel positions. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to adjust the interval between characters on a sub-pixel by sub-pixel basis (column 11, lines 52-64).

Re Claim 4:

Koyama further discloses the subpixel-font generating device placing the subpixels constituting the pixels at positions of the corresponding pixels when the pixels constituting the font data are arranged in a horizontal line or in a vertical line (e.g., column 13, lines 10-32).

Re Claim 5:

Koyama does not explicitly disclose the term “performing the pattern correction using a matching pattern of 3 by 3 pixels”.

However, Koyama discloses pattern correction using a plurality of patterns including the auxiliary patterns according to the font typefaces and sizes (*see e.g., Figs. 55-56 wherein a plurality of patterns are disclosed with each attribute table with respect to the character size and typeface or stroke*). It would have been obvious to have modified Koyama’s patterns for correcting the subpixel color levels using the pattern matching of finding the correct pattern with respect to the particular font typeface and size. It would have been obvious to have used any different pattern matching technique from those disclosed in Koyama to control the color gradation levels of the subpixels. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to virtually increase the resolution of the characters being displayed on the display device and parts of a character such as oblique lines or curves can be displayed smooth and thereby significantly improving the character display quality (column 10, lines 1-7).

Re Claim 6:

Koyama further discloses detecting edges included in the subpixel fonts wherein the skeleton data 42d defines the skeleton shape of a character according to the character code for

Art Unit: 2672

identifying the character data indicating the number of strokes included in the character and stroke information for each stroke and the subpixel color element level arrangement of the character is obtained by combining together the respective sub-pixel color element level arrangement for the strokes included in the skeleton data 42d (see column 23, lines 17-28) and therefore the program and data stored in the auxiliary storage device allows an edge detecting to detect edges or skeleton included in the subpixel fonts. Moreover, Koyama discloses that the character display program along with a plurality of pattern fonts stored in the storage apparatus 40 and when executed by the CPU 21, the character font is generated by correcting the color element level of each subpixel and the brightness level of each sub-pixel is transferred to the display device 10; Figs. 52A-67A and the corresponding disclosure regarding these figures. Therefore, Koyama discloses a gradation setting device that sets the color gradation level of the pixels along the edge to an intermediate gradation level.

Re Claim 7:

Koyama further discloses setting the color levels for the sub-pixels according to the pattern data and therefore the color levels for the sub-pixels constituting the character increases and the color levels for the sub-pixels constituting the background decreases (Figs. 5-8, 12 and 14).

Re Claim 8:

Koyama further discloses a storage device that stores font data generated by the font processor (Figs. 15A-15E) and a display unit that displays the font data generated by the font processor (column 13, lines 10-28).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jin-Cheng Wang whose telephone number is (571) 272-7665. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 6:30 (Mon-Thu).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Razavi can be reached on (571) 272-7664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2672

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jcw



MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600